

REMARKS:

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-12 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended, and claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1. Claim 7 has also been amended, and claim 8 has been incorporated into claim 7. Claims 2 and 8 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for inclusion of the word "type." Applicants have therefore deleted the word "type" from both claims, and therefore request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US. Patent No. 4,412,261 to Tateyama et al. ("Tateyama").

Claim 1 is directed to an air blower apparatus for use in an inspection apparatus, the air blower apparatus comprising an air blowing device for blowing air via an air filter to a recording medium being measured and to a recording apparatus for recording data on the recording medium. Claim 1 as amended recites "the air blower apparatus further comprises a second buffer space provided between said fan and said air filter and within said fan unit, said second buffer space temporarily accumulating the air discharged from said fan so as to provide a high pressure state."

Tateyama has a magnetic disk memory device which has a shroud accommodating replaceable or changeable disk packs and air passages through which air is circulated to cool the disk packs and the access mechanism. This air passage is formed, when a shroud cover for closing the space in the shroud is in the closing position, to recirculate the air through the space in the shroud, and, when the shroud cover is in the opening position, to discharge the air delivered by a blower to the outside of the shroud through the opening of the latter. The air passage has an air filter for filtrating the air. (Abstract).

The Office Action states that Tateyama has a second buffer space provide in fan housing so as the second buffer space temporarily accumulates the air discharged from the fan to provide a high pressure area (see col. 4, lines 22-54) (Office Action, page 3).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the characterization that has been made of Tateyama within the Office Action.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully state that Tateyama does not disclose or suggest “a second buffer area for **providing a high pressure state,**” as recited in claim 1, as amended. Instead, a second buffer area indicated by the Office Action regarding Tateyama would not be in a high pressure state.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that Tateyama does not expressly nor inherently describe all of the elements set forth in claim 1 as amended, and thus does not anticipate amended claim 1 or render amended claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claim 1.

Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateyama. By virtue of their dependencies upon claim 1, claims 3-6 are also patentable over Tateyama. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 3-6.

Claim 7 is directed to a computer-readable recording medium storing a program for enabling a computer function as an image view display and a code view display. The Examiner’s rejection of claim 7 is overcome for at least some of the same reasons that the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1 is overcome. These reasons include Tateyama neither disclosing or suggesting “a second buffer area for **providing a high pressure state.**” (Emphasis added.)

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that Tateyama does not expressly or inherently describe all of the elements set forth in claim 7, and thus, Tateyama does not render claim 7 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claim 7.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateyama. By virtue of their dependencies upon claim 7, claims 9-12 are also patentable over Tateyama. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 9-12.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

6/28/05

Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Reg. No. 31,019

Attorney for the Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: 203-327-4500
Fax: 203-327-6401